

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/812,646	LIEW, CHOONG-CHIN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Juliet C. Switzer	1634	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Juliet C. Switzer. (3)_____.

(2) Amy DeCloux. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 05 December 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner gave her general impressions of the amendments that were received 10/17/07. The examiner reiterated that the technology of the subject application is highly unpredictable, and that a declaration may be helpful to overcome the rejections of record. The examiner pointed out that contrary to many of the arguments filed with the amendments, many of the claims are sufficiently broad so as to encompass any type of control (i.e. healthy or not, see claim 80). The examiner indicated that it is not clear if there is descriptive support for "at least two times higher" expression (for example claim 69) and even if there is, it is not clear that there is enabling support for this cut off. Other potential new matter issues include "a p value of <0.05 " and the limitation "leukocytes which have not been fractionated into cell types." The examiner also indicated that the new claims would have to be considered for possible prior art issues and that no search was completed prior to the interview.